



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,438	08/27/2001	Shirley J. Provinse	40655.4900	8195
66170	7590	01/02/2008		EXAMINER
		AMERICAN EXPRESS TRAVEL RELATED SERVICES CO., INC. c/o SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P. ONE ARIZONA CENTER 400 E. VAN BUREN STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202		AKINTOLA, OLABODE
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
				NOTIFICATION DATE DELIVERY MODE
				01/02/2008 ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

HSOBELMAN@SWLAW.COM
DMIER@SWLAW.COM
JESLICK@SWLAW.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/943,438	PROVINSE, SHIRLEY J.
	Examiner Olabode Akintola	Art Unit 3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6, 11-16 and 25-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 11-16 and 25-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 11-16 and 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Northington et al. (USPN 6128602) in view of Harada et al (USPAP 20030108440) and further in view of Dunn et al. (USPN 5134564) and further in view of Steury et al (USPAP 20020007327).

Re claims 1-6, 11-16 and 25-34: Northington teaches a method of providing account reconciliation for an account comprising the steps of: receiving at a computing device, travel transactions relating to at least one of: air carrier, lodging and car rental form a database and charge transactions; storing said merchant transactions and said charge transactions on a pending

list within a database of said computing device; identifying a first match and second match from said pending list comprising at least one of said travel transactions and at least one of said charge transactions, said match determined by a commonality shared between said transactions, wherein said commonality includes a traveler name, financial account identifier, currency amount, and at least one of: a ticket number and reservation number; storing said match on an approved items list within said database; storing the unmatched merchant and charge transactions, if any, from said pending list on an unresolved transactions list within said database (col. 3, lines 11-20; col. 14, lines 11-23; col. 15, lines 37-67).

Northington does not explicitly teach preprocessing said merchant transactions and said charge transactions to remove from said pending list, a debit value and a credit value which are offsetting transactions; searching said database for a first near-match and second near-match comprising one of said merchant transactions and one of said charge transactions; receiving an approval notification of said near-match; storing said near-match on said approved items list; and repeating these steps to approve other near-matches.

Harada teaches preprocessing said merchant transactions and said charge transactions to remove from said pending list, a debit value and a credit value which are offsetting transactions (section 0049). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Northington to include this step as taught by Harada. One would have been motivated to this in order to cancel offsetting debit and credit.

Dunn teaches searching said database for a first near-match and second near-match comprising one of said merchant transactions and one of said charge transactions; receiving an approval notification of said first near-match and second near-match; storing said first near-match and

second near-match on said approved items list (col. 3, lines 19- 24; col. 3, line 52- col. 32, line 13; col. 20, lines 26-30; Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Northington to include these steps as taught by Dunn in order to speed up the account reconciliation process by determining probably matches using matching criteria.

Steury teaches wherein the travel transaction and charge transactions are received from two different unrelated entities (see at least section 0047; 0057-0058, figs. 1-8). It would have been an obvious design choice to receive two different transaction data from two unrelated entities. This basic concept is well known in the business environment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Malcolm (USPN 6006204) teaches correlation transaction records via user-specified identifier creating unclear transaction.

Black (USPN 7117172) teaches offsetting credit value and debit value (col. 49, lines 51-67).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER